



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 12/244,794 | 10/03/2008 | CARSTEN ZIEGLER | 2008P00109US | 2662 |

62730 7590 01/31/2017
SAP SE
3410 HILLVIEW AVENUE
PALO ALTO, CA 94304

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

MORRIS, JOHN J

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2157

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-------------------|---------------|

01/31/2017

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

APRIL.MENG@SAP.COM
GIPinhouse@sap.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte CARSTEN ZIEGLER

Appeal 2016-001593
Application 12/244,794
Technology Center 2100

Before ELENi MANTIS MERCADER, JAMES W. DEJMEK, and
STEVEN M. AMUNDSON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

AMUNDSON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellant¹ seeks our review under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a final rejection of claims 1–23, i.e., all pending claims. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Invention

The invention relates generally to the software arts and more specifically to data versioning with time dependency and active/inactive

¹ According to Appellant, the real party in interest is SAP SE. Br. 3.

states. Spec. ¶ 1, Abstract.² A version state indicates whether a particular version from a set of versions is active or inactive. Abstract.

Exemplary Claim

Independent claim 1 exemplifies the subject matter of the claims under consideration and reads as follows:

1. A method comprising:

creating a first version of an object in an application with a version state and an initial timestamp, wherein the application supports a versioning mode in a unit included in a graphical user interface of the application that can be switched between on and off more than once for the object, and wherein a value of the version state is initially set to inactive indicating that the created first version is inactive until the version state value of the created first version is set to active;

activating the first version of the object by setting the version state value of the first version from inactive to active at a first timestamp with the versioning mode switched on;

automatically creating a second version of the object upon a change to the first version of the object, wherein the version state value of the first version is set to active and the version state value of the second version is initially set to inactive indicating that the created second version is inactive until the version state value of the created second version is set to active;

activating the second version of the object by setting the version state value of the second version to active at a second timestamp with the versioning mode switched off, wherein the first timestamp and the second timestamp indicate a validity period of the first version; and

² This decision uses the following abbreviations: “Spec.” for the Specification, filed October 3, 2008; “Final Act.” for the Final Office Action, mailed December 16, 2014; “Br.” for the Appeal Brief, filed April 22, 2015; and “Ans.” for the Examiner’s Answer, mailed September 10, 2015.

copying back one or more new versions of the object to the second version of the object while the versioning mode is switched off.

Br. 12 (Claims App.).

The Prior Art Supporting the Rejections on Appeal

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Choy et al. ("Choy") | US 2003/0200235 A1 | Oct. 23, 2003 |
| McCauley et al. ("McCauley") | US 2006/0041558 A1 | Feb. 23, 2006 |
| Verma et al. ("Verma") | US 2007/0233683 A1 | Oct. 4, 2007 |
| Becker et al. ("Becker") | US 2009/0313309 A1 | Dec. 17, 2009 (filed June 13, 2008) |

The Rejections on Appeal

Claims 1–7 and 17–23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Becker, Choy, Verma, and McCauley. Final Act. 3–14; Ans. 2–14.

Claims 8–16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Becker, Choy, and McCauley. Final Act. 14–19; Ans. 14–18.

ANALYSIS

We have reviewed the rejections of claims 1–23 in light of Appellant’s arguments that the Examiner erred. For the reasons explained below, we disagree with Appellant’s assertions regarding error by the Examiner. We adopt the Examiner’s findings in the Final Office Action and Answer and add the following primarily for emphasis.

The Rejection of Claims 1–7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

SWITCHING THE VERSIONING MODE
ON AND OFF MORE THAN ONCE

Appellant argues the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 because McCauley “does not teach or suggest at least ‘versioning mode . . . be switched between on and off more than once for the object’, as recited in Claim 1.” Br. 7 (emphasis omitted). In particular, Appellant contends McCauley “merely teaches that the version control can be either switched on or off, but not switched between on and off more than once” for an object. *Id.*

The Examiner finds, however, McCauley teaches turning version control on or off for an object as well as checking an object into and out of version control. Ans. 19 (citing McCauley ¶¶ 105, 116); *see* Final Act. 6; Ans. 5. We find checking an object out of version control corresponds to turning version control off, while checking an object into version control corresponds to turning version control on. McCauley teaches different users may check an object out of and back into version control at different times. McCauley ¶ 116. We find repeatedly checking an object out of and back into version control corresponds to repeatedly turning version control off and on. Consequently, Appellant has not persuasively argued the Examiner erred in applying McCauley to claim 1.

ACTIVATING DIFFERENT VERSIONS WITH THE
VERSIONING MODE SWITCHED ON AND OFF

Appellant argues the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 because Becker “does not teach or suggest at least ‘activating the first version of the object . . . with the versioning mode switched on . . . [and] activating the second version of the object . . . with the versioning mode switched off . . .’,

as recited in Claim 1.” Br. 8 (emphasis omitted). Appellant notes that Becker discloses a data pattern or data structure for storing information that includes (1) an identity table containing an identify row, (2) a version table containing a version row, and (3) an audit table containing an audit row. *Id.*; *see* Becker ¶¶ 30, 38, 41, 45, Fig. 1A. Appellant then argues that (1) Becker’s “audit row and identity row are in two different tables” contrary to claim 1 and (2) Becker does not teach or suggest activating different versions of either the audit row or the identity row “with [the] versioning mode switched on and off respectively.” Br. 8.

The Examiner finds, however, that Becker’s identity table, version table, and audit table “are all associated and relate to each other for the same object.” Ans. 20; *see, e.g.*, Becker Fig. 1A. Appellant did not file a Reply Brief and did not dispute that finding. In addition, the Examiner finds that Becker teaches activating a first version of an object by creating a new object with the versioning mode switched on because “activating a version row in the version table . . . indicates that [the] versioning mode was switched on.” Ans. 20 (citing Becker ¶ 41); *see* Final Act. 3–4; Ans. 3. The Examiner also finds that Becker teaches switching the versioning mode off and activating a second version of the object. Ans. 20 (citing Becker ¶¶ 30, 41, 67); *see* Final Act. 4; Ans. 3. For instance, Becker discloses second version activation, e.g., simultaneous with first version deactivation. *See, e.g.*, Becker ¶ 67. Further, Becker instructs that a subsequent (or second) version may modify or overwrite an earlier (or first) version with the versioning mode switched off. *Id.* ¶ 30. Accordingly, Appellant has not persuasively argued the Examiner erred in applying Becker to claim 1.

COPYING BACK A NEW VERSION WITH
THE VERSIONING MODE SWITCHED OFF

Appellant argues the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 because Choy “does not teach or suggest at least ‘copying back one or more new versions of the object to the second version of the object while the versioning mode is switched off . . .’, as recited in Claim 1.” Br. 8 (emphasis omitted). In particular, Appellant contends that Choy (1) discloses replacing an item’s child component with a client input value with version control switched off and (2) does not “teach or suggest replacing new versions of the object with the second version of [the] child component.” *Id.* at 8–9.

The Examiner finds, however, that Choy teaches replacing various components for an item with version control switched off. Ans. 20–21 (citing Choy ¶ 44, Figs. 3, 5); *see* Final Act. 2, 5; Ans. 4. More specifically, Choy shows that with version control switched off a client input value may replace either an item’s root component or an item’s child component. Choy Figs. 3, 5. Replacing either the root component or the child component corresponds to copying back a new version of an object, i.e., overwriting an existing version with a new version. *See* Ans. 4, 20–21 (citing Choy Fig. 5 no. 505 for root component replacement and no. 515 for child component replacement); *see also* Final Act. 5. Consequently, Appellant has not persuasively argued the Examiner erred in applying Choy to claim 1.

SUMMARY FOR CLAIMS 1–7

For the reasons discussed above, Appellant’s arguments have not persuaded us that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 for obviousness based on Becker, Choy, Verma, and McCauley. Hence, we sustain the

rejection. Appellant does not make any separate patentability arguments for dependent claims 2–7. Br. 10–11. Because Appellant does not argue the claims separately, we sustain the rejections of claims 2–7. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv).

The Rejections of Claims 8–23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Appellant does not make any separate patentability arguments for claims 8–23. Br. 9–11. Because Appellant does not argue the claims separately, we sustain the rejections of claims 8–23. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv).

DECISION

We affirm the Examiner’s decision to reject claims 1–23.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED